

and smoke and everything. And most of the people are around people that smoke, like their parents and stuff.

ON BEHALF OF DANIELLE HARVEY, ANDREA SHAHAN, AND STEPHANIE GRAY

REGARDING OPPOSITION TO PARENTAL NOTIFICATION FOR ABORTION—MAY 7, 2001

DANIELLE HARVEY: This year, the Vermont House has discussed the question of making parental notification for abortion a requirement. We feel that this would be making a big mistake. Having to tell your parents you are sexually active is hard enough; having to tell them that you are pregnant as a result could be dangerous, maybe even life-threatening. For this reason, as well as others, some girls delay in telling their parents about the predicament, which could cause some major health risks, such as: When someone goes out of state to avoid parental involvement laws, they are putting themselves at risk during the trip home, because there may be long stretches where medical care is not readily available. Parents who are opposed to abortion might force their daughters to carry the babies to Term, regardless of any possible or known health or life risks. Or a woman who is pregnant and a few months short of her 18th birthday may wait until she is 18 to have the abortion. A delay of even five days can cause major complication in a procedure. If the government and the state of Vermont, as well as the national government, wants what is best for the nation's youth, they should leave parents out of a girl's decision to have an abortion. The decision is hard enough to make on her own, and adding parents to the situation makes it almost impossible.

STEPHANIE GRAY: If a child is forced to tell her parents that she is pregnant, then her parents would know that she is sexually active. Most of the time, parents don't approve. Finding out she is sexually active and pregnant could cause verbal or physical abuse by her parents. The girl's parents may force her to go through with the pregnancy, or they may even kick her out. Family breakdown is a major result from girls telling their parents that they're pregnant and want an abortion. Girls that don't have a good relationship with their parents to begin with will probably make it worse and risk abuse. Families with good relationships don't need the law, because they are supportive. Then again, you might lose the family trust. In unsupportive families, the law will be ineffective because the families would be more likely to be abusive and add to the family's problems.

ANDREA SHAHAN: Some supporters of parental notification concede that some parents can become abusive when they learn their daughter wants to receive an abortion, and they have offered an option of going before a judge, instead of their parents, to get permission to receive an abortion. This option is known as the judicial waiver. Women who live in sparsely populated areas usually have difficulty receiving a judicial waiver, since easy access to a judge is not possible. Women who live in large cities, however, have easy access to courthouses, therefore not making it fair to many women in the U.S. In receiving a judicial review, confidentiality is not guaranteed. Many teens lack the knowledge and experience of court procedures to obtain a waiver. Students who need to attend their hearings will not be able to do so during school hours. Many of the court judges are very strongly pro-life. Even though the Supreme Court requires judges to issue a waiver if the teen is mature or if an abortion is in her best interests, several

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

judges still deny them a waiver. Judge Nixon, of the District Court in Tennessee estimated that, even under the best Circumstances, the judicial waiver process would take 22 days to complete. This becomes a significant problem, given the time-sensitive nature of pregnancy, and the risk involved in later abortions. Representative Sanders, we oppose any efforts to put into effect parental notification under Vermont law, and we hope that you will oppose any efforts at the federal level as well. Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY CELEBRATES THE BOROUGH OF ROCKY HILL AND THE TRI-CENTENNIAL HERITAGE DAY

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 2001

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Borough of Rocky Hill, New Jersey and its Tri-Centennial Heritage Day celebration. For three centuries, the community of Rocky Hill has made tremendous contributions to our state and our nation through its legacy of committed residents and unique spirit of pride and unity.

Rocky Hill, less than one square mile in size, has a rich history that began in 1717 when John Harrison obtained land from Indian Chief Nowenock. Then, in 1783, as he awaited the news that the Treaty of Paris had been signed, General George Washington prepared his famed "Farewell to the Troops" at his home Rockingham, located in Rocky Hill.

As we know it, Rocky Hill enjoyed industrial success at the turn of the century due to its proximity to the Delaware and Raritan Canal as well as the opening of the New Jersey Railroad and Transportation Company's spur line along the Millstone River. This water traffic carried not only passengers, but lumber, coal and vegetables.

Rocky Hill has been home to not only President and General George Washington, but John Hart, a New Jersey Signer of the Declaration of Independence as well as a more recent outstanding American, former Rocky Hill Council-Member, Bill Fallon, a victim of the tragic September 11th attack.

Rocky Hill is home to a tight-knit community of families and friends and the celebration of the Tri-Centennial presents an opportunity to pause and reflect on our history and to strengthen and renew our spirit for the centuries to come.

Mr. Speaker, again, I celebrate this Tri-Centennial Heritage Day and honor the Borough of Rocky Hill and its residents, both past and present, who have worked so diligently to make this day possible. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this community and its 300th anniversary.

October 5, 2001

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ackerman-Houghton Amendment to prohibit the marketing of animals so sick they oftentimes cannot even walk. Animals too weak from sickness or injury are routinely pushed, kicked, dragged, and prodded with electric shocks in an effort to move them at auctions and intermediate markets, en route to slaughter. There is no excuse of this unnecessary torment.

This amendment will protect these animals by preventing bad actors from transporting downed animals to livestock markets and requiring these downed animals to be humanely euthanized.

Unfortunately, because livestock sold for human consumption will be a higher dollar than livestock sold for other purposes, greed has proven to be more important to some than the suffering of the animals or the knowledge that meat from these animals is likely to be unfit for consumption.

These animals do not deserve this treatment and we do not deserve the threat of contaminated meat at our grocery stores. As Co-Chair of the Congressional Friends of Animals Caucus, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Ackerman-Houghton Downed Animal Amendment.

FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 2001

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011:

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative Sherwood to permanently extend the Northeast Dairy Compact.

Furthermore, I am distressed that this amendment was unable to receive a waiver from the Judiciary Committee, and thus will not receive an up or down vote.

New York's dairy farmers, which make up 60 percent of our agricultural base in my home State, have been cut out of this legislation. Producers and their organizations have been concerned about the viability of the dairy industry in the northeastern States for several years.

Declining herd and cattle numbers, combined with drought and fluctuating market